

USAID/Senegal
Cereals Production, Phase II
Project N° 685-0235

PD-ABD-034
72729

PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

USAID/ADO

March, 1991

Prepared by: Mamadou Ba, ADO

Approved by: Julius E. Coles
Mission Director

Julius E. Coles

Date of Approval:

6/28/1991

PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

The objective of this report is to present the status of this project at the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD). It measures the extent to which the project successfully accomplished the various objectives set at the project design stage.

Project Background

The Cereals Production, Phase II Project was authorized on December 18, 1979. Its purpose was to improve the extension and research capabilities of the Government of Senegal to reach the rural farm families in the Groundnut Basin (GNB). The major implementing agency was SODEVA. ISRA was responsible for agronomic research activities. However, as the project evolved, Senegalese and USAID officials realized that maintaining and improving agricultural production in the GNB could only be accomplished through the use of agricultural production systems and techniques which protect the natural resources and maximize the use of rainfall and meet the needs of the rural population for food, fuel, forage and other products. Therefore, the Mission and the GOS agreed, in 1985, to extend the project to focus remaining project activities on an agroforestry/soil conservation pilot program in the Thies and Diourbel regions of Senegal. The initial Project Paper was amended on April 4, 1985 and the remaining project funds reprogrammed for an expansion of an agroforestry soil conservation pilot program under the Cereals II project with SODEVA, ISRA, Eaux & Forêts and the U.S. Peace Corps as implementing agencies.

I. Summary of Major Objectives

- a) In the initial PP: Improve the extension and research capabilities of the Government of Senegal to reach the entire farm family.
- b) As revised in PP Supplement:
 - 1) Identify, test, disseminate and evaluate a series of agroforestry and soil conservation techniques designed to maintain soil productivity;

- 2) Improve the capacity of GOS agencies to design, implement and evaluate agroforestry and soil conservation programs.

II. Significant Project Events

<u>Events</u>	<u>Date</u>
A. Project Authorization (\$7,700,000 - 5 yrs)	December 18, 1979
B. Project Agreement (Obligation of funds:\$1,500,000)	December 31, 1979
C. Project Agreement Amendment One (Obligation of funds:\$1,682,000)	December 18, 1980
D. Project Agreement Amendment Two (Obligation of funds:\$3,400,000)	September 29, 1982
E. Project Agreement Amendment Three (Obligation of funds:\$1,118,000)	August 29, 1983
F. Mid term Evaluation	December, 1983
G. Project Paper Supplement	April 4, 1985
H. Project Agreement Amendment Four (to put emphasis on agroforestry and extend PACD to December 31, 1987)	May 6, 1985
I. Final Evaluation	December, 1987
J. Project Agreement Amendment Five (extend PACD to June 30, 1988 for completion of wells)	February 11, 1988
K. Project Agreement Amendment Six (extend PACD to December 31, 1988 for completion of wells)	June 3, 1988
L. Act on Memo & Project Authorization Amendment to the Administrator (to extend PACD to December 31, 1990)	May 29, 1990
M. Project PACD and close-out	December 31, 1990

III. Project Assumptions

There were two basic assumptions made during the design of the Project:

- 1) The GOS and donors agreed to support long-term interventions and investments in the project area;
- 2) Villagers, religious leaders and others had to support the need to protect the environment.

IV. Project Implementation and Accomplishments

Phase II of the project was designed in 1979 to continue and reinforce what has been achieved under Phase I (1974-79) in building up SODEVA's institutional capacity to interact with the national agricultural research organization (ISRA). Under these projects, SODEVA was to work with ISRA to formulate and evaluate joint field trials the results of which would be more effectively transmitted to the farmer, leading to increased and diversified agricultural production in the expanded project area. Unfortunately, due to several constraints, the project did not achieve its objectives under phase I. Some of these constraints are mentioned in this paragraph. The mid-term evaluation undertaken in December 1984 recommended that the PP be amended and emphasis be placed upon agroforestry and soil conservation. This solution would permit AID to continue its support to the GOS without additional funding (the balance of funds remaining in the project could be used for this new program emphasis). The Project continued, involving other GOS agencies such as ISRA Forestry Department and Peace Corps. This resulted in creating a bureaucratic logjam at the management level. The project covered 63 villages. The agroforestry and soil conservation activities were carried out in a successful manner. The critical problem that this phase had to face occurred at the end of the program, when it was decided to dig 20 wells for selected villages for their shown interest in the project's activities. When completed, it was anticipated that these wells would allow villagers to have their own nurseries, produce their own seedlings and, therefore, save money and time. They would even sell the surplus of seedlings to other villages, which would constitute an income generation activity. The first contractor, SNEAD, started construction but had conflicts working with SODEVA. The issue went to court and they are still waiting for a ruling. The Ministry of Hydraulics then accepted to dig the wells itself. An action which was supposed to take six months has taken two years, due to delays

and misunderstandings. Finally the Mission had to seek AID/W authorization to extend the project assistance completion date to have the wells completed. In summary, the Cereals Production II Project and its agroforestry, soil conservation program faced many problems. Some of them were:

- Between project design and the beginning of implementation, the entire policy and institutional framework within which SODEVA operated developed serious internal problems. The supply system for the factors of production and the agricultural product purchasing organization virtually disappeared. Short-term credit for inputs was cancelled. The cooperatives came under severe scrutiny and were generally discredited. Thus, the production targets originally set in the PP were unachievable, since the farmer was simultaneously faced with a continuation of the downward trend in total rainfall and the lack of availability of improved seed, fertilizer and credit.
 - There were many staff changes in the project that compounded problems between headquarters and the field.
 - SODEVA's annual budget submissions were late for a variety of reasons and the initial disbursement system of advance payments was stopped after a very negative Audit Report (1981). SODEVA was then required to prefinance a considerable proportion of project expenses and since the GOS did not cover counterpart costs in a timely manner, SODEVA had to borrow on the commercial market to continue its operations.
- During the agroforestry phase, the main problem was that there were too many agencies involved. This meant that decisions couldn't be made easily so field work suffered.

Despite all these important problems, the Project made some significant accomplishments:

- A new agroforestry system is being used in 63 villages; this innovation involved villages creating their own nurseries, to produce the seedlings they needed for their woodlots and windbreaks;
- 10 new wells constructed and 9 rehabilitated;
- 46 GOS agents trained in analyzing and implementing agroforestry programs;
- A documentation center fully operational.

V. Financial Summary- see annex A

VI. Project Inputs

The major inputs to the project have been provided and utilized for project implementation. These inputs included: technical assistance, training, commodities and construction.

A) Technical Assistance: At the beginning of the project, technical assistance was provided by Aurora Associates. Technical assistance was provided and areas covered were the following: Agronomy, Audiovisual support and Agricultural Economics. During the agroforestry phase, ISTI provided the services of a Forester. Short-term consultants were hired by both Aurora Associates and ISTI whenever the need arose.

B) Training: Three long-term masters level training and specialized short courses for SODEVA, ISRA and Eaux & Forêts personnel as well as training to upgrade the capabilities of SODEVA field agents were funded through this project.

C) Commodities: A large amount of commodities including vehicles, audio-visual equipment and materials, agricultural research equipment, agricultural production equipment and forestry supplies were purchased under this project. These commodities greatly contributed to the attainment by the project of its major objectives. A pertinent example of this is the audiovisual center in Pout. The project provided it with relevant equipment so that seminars and training sessions are always taking place in the center. Some participants believe the center is the most functional in West Africa.

D) Construction: Funding was provided for the construction of research and extension facilities. These were very appreciated and played a key role during the life of the project.

V. II. Lessons Learned

The original purpose of the Cereals project was to improve extension and research capabilities of the Government of Senegal to reach the entire farm family with improved, cultural recommendations designed to increase food production and farm incomes in the Groundnut Basin (GNB). As a bit of background, one should note that the GNB represents 75% of the national cultivated area and is experiencing severe environmental degradation in many areas due to human and livestock population pressure, drought and inappropriate farming techniques. To efficiently overcome these problems, emphasis must be put on agroforestry, soil and water conservation techniques, village level woodlots and windbreaks, and the integration of livestock into the production system.

During the life of the Project, the links between applied research and extension in the GNB should have been strengthened. When research is found to be worthwhile, an efficient mechanism needs to be used to disseminate this research. Research without extension or vice-versa is not productive.

Women constitute an important labor source in the GNB. They are very active in gardening, animal fattening, fuel conservation, use of millet mills and cookstoves, etc. New technologies should be made available to them to promote their activities. Literacy could also be of great help for them.

- Acronyms used in this report:

- SODEVA : Société de Développement et de Vulgarisation Agricole
- ISRA : Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles
- ISTI : International Science and Technology Institute
- SNEAD : Société Nouvelle d'Etudes et d'Assistance au Développement

Drafter: ADO: M Ba: sw 32 Date 4/15/91
Clear : ADO: P Jones (in draft) Date 4/18/91
ADO: D Delgado (in draft) Date 5/2/91
PDO: L Franchette [Signature] Date 6/21/91
PRM: R Gilson (in draft) Date 5/29/91
CONT: W McKeel [Signature] Date 6/21/91

Annex A

<u>Line Item</u>	<u>\$ LOP Budget</u>
Technical Assistance	1,280
Training	280
Procurement	400
Construction	460
Operating Expenses	2,295
WID Component	20
CNRA Research	150
Counterpart Funds	415
Evaluation	100
Natural Resources Mgt/Agroforestry	2,100
Contingency	<u>200</u>
TOTAL	7,700

Life of project obligation	7,700,000
Previous deobligation	(1,111,621.65)
Total Project Obligation:	6,588,379.35
Total Project Earmarkings:	6,588,379.35
Total Project Disbursement:	6,562,993.35

Amount to de-obligate: \$25,386.00

5896A